DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 298 CE 024 633

AUTHOR Prey, Phillip O.
TITLE A Comparative Analysis of the Student/Subject Orientation of ABE Teachers in West Virginia.
INSTITUTION Marshall Univ., Huntington, W. Va. Dept. of Occupational, Adult, and Safety Education.
NOTE 36p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Basic Education; *Adult Educators; Comparative Analysis; *Personality Traits; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS Professional Activity Inventory; *West Virginia

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to (1) establish the subject or student orientation of adult basic education (ABE) teachers and non-ABE teachers in West Virginia and (2) identify the degree to which certain biographical and educational characteristics may be related to their orientation. Data for the study were based on responses of forty-one ABE instructors and ninety-eight non-ABE instructors who were given the Professional Activity Inventory for College Teachers. Findings of the study indicated that the group of ABE teachers are no more student-oriented than the group of non-ABE teachers. Single non-ABE teachers were found to be significantly more student-oriented than single ABE teachers. (Summary data tables are appended.) (LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED185298

A Comparative Analysis of the Student/Subject Orientation of ABE Teachers in West Virginia

by

Phillip O. Prey, Ed D

Marshall University
OAS Department
Huntington, W. V. 25701

CE 024 633

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Phillip O. Prey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Related Background Information	1
Statement of the Problem	2
Objectives of the Study	2
Importance of the Study	3
Limitations of the Study	3
Review of the Literature	4
Design, Procedures and Data Treatment	7
Analysis of Data	9
Summary and Conclusions	11
Table 1 RAW SCORE DATA OF ABE AND NON ABE TEACHERS	14
Table 2 RAW SCORE DATA OF ABE, ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND MISCELLANEOUS TEACHERS	15
Table 3 RAW SCORE DATA OF MALE ABE TEACHERS & MALE NON ABE TEACHERS	16
Table 4 RAW SCORE DATA OF FEMALE ABE TEACHERS & FEMALE NON ABE TEACHERS	17
Table 5 RAW SCORE DATA OF SINGLE ABE TEACHERS AND SINGLE NON ABE TEACHERS	18
Table 6 RAW SCORE DATA OF MARRIED ABE TEACHERS AND MARRIED NON ABE TEACHERS	19
Table 7 RAW SCORE DATA OF ABE TEACHERS WITH LESS THAN A MASTERS DEGREE AND NON ABE TEACHERS WITH LESS THAN A MASTERS DEGREE	20

Table of Contents
Page Two

	Page
Table 8 RAW SCORE DATA OF ABE TEACHERS WITH A MASTERS DEGREE OR GREATER AND NON ABE TEACHERS WITH A MASTERS DEGREE OR GREATER	21
Table 9 RAW SCORE DATA OF ABE TEACHERS WITH 3 OR FEWER YEARS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND NON ABE TEACHERS WITH 3 OR FEWER YEARS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHING EXPERIENCE	22
Table 10 RAW SCORE DATA OF ABE TEACHERS WITH 4 OR MORE YEARS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND NON ABE TEACHERS WITH 4 OR MORE YEARS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHING EXPERIENCE	23
Table 11 RAW SCORE DATA OF MALE ABE TEACHERS AND FEMALE ABE TEACHERS	24
Table 12 RAW SCORE DATA OF SINGLE ABE TEACHERS AND MARRIED ABE TEACHERS	25
Table 13 RAW SCORE DATA OF ABE TEACHERS WITH LESS THAN A MASTERS DEGREE AND ABE TEACHERS WITH A MASTERS DEGREE OR GREATER	26
Table 14 RAW SCORE DATA OF ABE TEACHERS WITH 10 OR FEWER ADULT EDUCATION CREDITS AND ABE TEACHERS WITH 11 OR MORE ADULT EDUCATION CREDITS	27
Table 15 RAW SCORE DATA OF ABE TEACHERS WITH 0-3, 4-6, 7-10, AND MORE THAN 10 YEARS ABE TEACHING EXPERIENCE	28
Table 16 RAW SCORE DATA OF ABE TEACHERS WITH THREE OR FEWER YEARS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHING EXPERIENCE AND ABE TEACHERS WITH FOUR OR MORE YEARS PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHING EXPERIENCE	29
Table 17 RAW SCORE DATA OF PART-TIME ABE TEACHERS AND FULL-TIME ABE TEACHERS	30
References	31

Introduction

Almost a decade ago Knowles (1970) wrote, "Andragogy calls for program builders and teachers who are person-centered, who don't teach subject matter but rather help persons to learn." Adult educators generally are willing to accept the idea that teachers of adults need to be people oriented individuals as opposed to being subject oriented. Likewise, most would agree that this quality is most critical for the ABE teacher.

If we are comfortable with the notion that "person-centeredness" is an essential ingredient in the "mix" that is an ABE teacher, it might be important to ask ourselves if that's what we have.

Some fifteen years ago, congress passed the enabling legislation which led to the establishing of the ABE teacher training projects. A short five year ago the state of West Virginia established such a project.

The purpose and intent of the teacher training programs was to prepare ABE teachers to more adequately fill that role. After five years, have we succeeded. Specifically, do we have an army of "person-centered" ABE teachers in the field?

This study was designed to look at that specific.

Related Background Information

In 1974, as a result of a Board of Regents mandate, one institution of higher learning in West Virginia was charged with the state-wide responsibility for ABE teacher training and inservice.

Since that time graduate courses in adult education have been taught both on and off campus for teachers in ABE. In addition, beginning in July of 1976, several workshops were offered each semester as inservice activities. Many were designed to acquaint the teachers with new methods, techniques and materials. Several were designed to enhance their "counseling" skills and in some way help them to be more "person-centered."

Statement of the Problem

The purposes of this study were: 1) to establish the "subject" or "student" orientation of ABE teachers and non-ABE teachers in West Virginia; 2) to identify, as nearly as possible, the degree to which certain biographical and educational characteristics may be related to their orientation.

Objectives of the Study

Primarily, the study was concerned with the following questions:

1) As a group, are the ABE teachers in West Virginia more "student" oriented than any other group of public school teachers?

2) As a group, are the ABE teachers in West Virginia more or less "student" oriented than non-ABE public school teachers with respect to the following characteristics:

    2.1 Sex
    2.2 Marital Status
    2.3 Highest Degree Held
    2.4 Years of public school teaching

Secondarily, the study was designed to look at certain characteristics within the group of ABE teachers regarding their "student" or "subject" orientedness. Specifically, it was concerned with the following question:

3) As a group, are the ABE teachers in West Virginia more or less "student" oriented when compared with respect to the following factors:

3.1 Sex
3.2 Marital Status
3.3 Amount of professional training in adult education
3.4 Highest Degree Held
3.5 Years of ABE teaching experience
3.6 Years of public school teaching experience
3.7 Employment status (full or part-time)

Importance of the Study

If we in the field of adult education believe that it takes a different kind of teacher to teach adults and that a part of that "differentness" is being more people-oriented than subject-oriented, it would be well for us to look at such an idea in reality. If it is important to have such individuals teaching in our ABE programs, do we in fact have them.

Such information is not now available for use in West Virginia and there is a strong suspicion that is is lacking in many other states as well. The need for such a study is evident in West Virginia and as such may serve to spur others on to such self-examination.

Limitations of the Study

As is the case in most studies there are certain limitations which are inherent in it.

By virtue of the fact that the study was confined to one state out of the 50 possible, the population available is a restricted one. A corollary to the above, is the fact that since the study

was confined to just the state of West Virginia there is a certain amount of risk involved in generalizing the findings to other states.

Review of the Literature

In reviewing the literature this researcher was impressed by the lack of such material. There has been a great deal of attention focused on the characteristics of those who teach. However, few of those studies have been directed toward the ABE teacher. An ERIC Search was no more productive, producing less than a dozen items, most of which are only indirectly related.

Frank Snyder (1968) conducted a study which concerned itself with the professional needs of ABE teachers in the state of Maryland. Unfortunately, it centered on the existing procedures for recruitment and selection of such teachers and the development of guidelines to enhance that process. Additional data collected, through survey and interview techniques, involved the attitudes and needs of 184 ABE teachers. Those needs, it turned out, were more active financial involvement by the local school districts, higher certification requirements, and a cooperatively planned ongoing inservice effort for all ABE teachers. Apparently, student orientedness on the part of ABE teachers was not a perceived need, since it was not mentioned as a selection criterion nor as a felt need of the teachers themselves.

Gary McDaniel (1969) compared the verbal behavior of 30 teachers teaching both ABE and public school classes. Of the four major

conclusions reached by him, two seem to have some bearing on this study. McDaniel concluded that teachers tend to accept student feelings and ideas more readily, in public school than in ABE classes. This would seem to indicate that the same person is more "student-oriented" toward the younger students than they are with the adult students. He also suggested that teachers involved in both types of classes used more praise, and tended to exert more direct influence, in the ABE classes.

One study, by Wallace Nave (1969), was directed at the ABE teacher trainers in North Carolina. However, its conclusion that such trainers acquire a better attitude toward ABE with increased training activity, doesn't help us much. Particularly when Nave suggests that differences existing between means may be due to the small sample size. Likewise, it doesn't tell us much about the attitude or the changes which take place in the trainee, or even if there are any.

Adult Vocational teachers were studied by Denver and Price (1972) as a part of an Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and technical education study. The study was designed to identify those behavioral teaching acts or patterns which characterize the effective adult vocational teacher as perceived by means of a questionnaire administered to eight co-ordinators of Adult Education Programs, seventy teachers of Adult Education in Vo-Tech Centers and 865 students. Yet, even here there is little one can use to

determine the student/subject orientedness of these adult teachers. Out of a 30 item questionnaire less than 1/6th of those items are related to behavioral characteristics which can be considered descriptive of a person centered teacher. On those few items, the ratings of the students were lower than either of the other two groups. This would seem to indicate that students either do not perceive such attributes as important as others or teachers are not ranked high in these areas.

Of particular interest, was a study done by Donald Mocker (1974) concerning the identification, classification, and ranking of appropriate ABE teacher competencies. Of the competencies he worked with, it would appear that those who did the ranking of those competencies, tended to agree that student or people oriented ones were of a higher order than others. However, the study only indicates the appropriateness of such competencies not the possession of such. All of which seems to point toward what we in Adult Education have always said; teachers of adults should be student oriented. Yet, should is not the same as are. This study then, was designed to look at the "what is" as opposed to the "what should be."

Design, Procedures and Data Treatment

"People or student" oriented instructors are individuals who would be more concerned with helping people learn than teaching subject matter. This study was designed to look at the student/subject orientedness of the ABE teachers in West Virginia. It was also structured in a way which would allow for the comparison of these characteristics with certain other selected factors.

At the time the study was done there were a total of two hundred twelve ABE teachers in the state. This figure included 155 part-time and 57 full-time instructors. Through a name drawing random selection process a total of 25 full-time and 75 part-time instructors were selected. The Professional Activity Inventory for College Teachers (PAI) was sent to each of these 100 ABE instructors. Returned instruments totaled 51. Of those returned, 10 were non-usable instruments leaving 41 usable in the study. The non ABE teachers were included on the basis of their availability. That is: they were on campus during the summer in various classes and, with the cooperation of several departments within the college of education, the same instrument was administered to one hundred and twelve different subjects. This resulted in a total of 98 usable instruments for the study. Of those 98, 37 were elementary teachers, 51 were secondary teachers, and 10 were classified as miscellaneous (special education, counseling, etc.).

For purposes of this study an ABE teacher was defined as follows: Full-time ABE teacher - is a person who is so designated by the county school system for which he works and is being paid on a contract basis as such. Part-time ABE teacher - is a person who is

not designated as full-time by the county for which he works and is not paid on a contract basis. He is paid on an hourly basis, though some work almost forty hours per week. However, this was the exception -- not the rule.

Professional training in adult education was equated with college credit courses on a pre-service or inservice basis. Partial years of ABE teaching experience were rounded to the next higher year with no differentiation being made between full or part-time experience.

All data were treated in the following manner - Mean scores were tested for significance at the .05 level by means of the t test where appropriate. In one instance, because of the number of subjects in one group, the Mann-Whitman U test was also used. However, since the results obtained were the same it will not be reported here, only noted by the table. Where more than two factors were a part of the data being treated, analysis of variance for unequal N's was used.

Analysis of Data

Tables I and II show the results of the data gathered in relation to the first concern of the project as noted on page 2.

As indicated in table one, as a group, the ABE teachers are no more student oriented than the group of non-ABE teachers. With a possible score of "plus" or "minus" 100 on the PAI it is interesting to note how close both groups' mean scores come to being almost neutral. Of passing interest is the fact that both the highest and lowest scores are found to belong to the non-ABE group. Table I shows the results of comparing the ABE group with the non-ABE group when it was divided into area of assignment.

The results are not surprising in light of the total groups' performance. While probabilities are considerably less in this instance the mean scores are not much better. In fact, as indicated, two of them are even closer to being neutral.

By looking at the mean scores only, it appears that as a group the non-ABE teachers are slightly more student oriented than the ABE group. It seems that this slight difference may be due to the elementary teachers in that group, which is not surprising.

Table III through X contain the data relative to the second question about which the investigation was concerned.

Item 2.1 is covered in tables III and IV. A glance at these tables quickly reveals that the male ABE teachers are not significantly more student oriented that the male non-ABE teachers. In fact, when considering the mean scores only, it appears that the male non-ABE teachers are almost twice as student oriented as the male ABE teachers. The female ABE teachers and the non-ABE female

teachers are not significantly different in their student orientation either.

Tables V and VI are related to item 2.2. As indicated in table V there is, apparently, a significant difference in the student orientation of the single teachers. As noted on the bottom of the table the less powerful Mann-Whitney was also used on this item with the same result. However, the direction of that difference is not favorable to the ABE teacher. It seems that, as a group, single non-ABE teachers are much more student oriented.

In table VI are the data concerning those married teachers in each group. On the basis of the mean scores the direction of difference is more favorable to the ABE teachers even though there is no significant difference between the two groups.

The data pertaining to item 2.3 are recorded in tables VII and VIII. In reference to this area it appears that the possession of an advanced degree is no more student orienting than the absence of it. As can be seen, there is no significant difference between either grouping. The difference between mean scores in either grouping is about the same. Even though all means are positively oriented, they are surely not very far into that positive area.

The last set of data for this area of concern, which is item 2.4, are found in tables IX ans X. The familiar pattern of non-significance is again apparent in these data. The number of years of experience in public school teaching does not seem to have a significant affect on either group. The only trend which seems to be notable is the fact that those ABE teachers with more than

four years of such experience are much less student oriented, as a group, than are those with less than four.

In the section on the objectives of the study reference was made to a secondary concern related to the comparison of certain characteristics within the ABE group itself. The seven items treated in this part of the study are listed there.

The following is a presentation of the results of that treatment.

A quick review of the tables reveals a total lack of significant differences. The study's first negative mean scores also show up in this part of the investigation. Worth noting is the fact that, for most items treated, though the trend is generally toward the positive student oriented side, the mean scores do not seem to indicate a strong orientation. This becomes more apparent when comparing the obtained means, in the various categories, with the +100 possible score. Only two of those mean scores are over 15.

Based on the data in tables XI through XVII it would appear that, even within the ABE group itself, these seven factors have no significance with regard to the individual's orientation.

Summary and Conclusions

Review of the data resulting from the investigation suggests that the ABE teachers in West Virginia are not a strongly student oriented group. Furthermore, there is some indication that selected characteristics of the group seem to have little bearing on their orientation.

More to the point, and of some concern, is the apparent lack

of any significant difference between the ABE teachers with adult education training in excess of 10 credit hours and those with less.

Even though the mean score of the former group is more than double that of the latter, it apparently is not enough to make a significant difference. This might well lead one to conclude that once the individual has been exposed to 10 credit hours of training anything over that results in very little gain.

There is a real risk in arriving at such a conclusion because there is nothing to compare it with.

Since the study is an ex-post-facto design, there is no way of knowing where these subjects were, in their orientation, before the instruction was taken.

There is some suspicion that the instruction provides little or no gain in the student orientation of ABE teachers. Such a conjecture is based on the knowledge that both full and part-time ABE teachers are drawn from the ranks of teacher education program certified people. Since one of the differences between the two groups treated would be the specific training in adult education methods and there is no significant difference in their orientations, the suspicion may be worth noting.

Why single non-ABE teachers should be significantly more student oriented than single ABE teachers is not easy to explain. Any explanation would have to be prefaced with a big "maybe." Since "single" includes a number of different statuses, guessing would surely be the most prevalent means of explanation. In such a situation one guess (yours) is as good as another (mine).

The larger questions center around an unexplored area, at least

as far as this study is concerned. That is effectiveness. The notion somehow exists that the more student oriented the ABE instructor is the more effective she/he will be.

This study was not designed to look at that aspect, yet it has occurred to this investigator that it should be.

If the research supports such a notion, and I'm not sure it does, the largest share of our ABE teachers, in West Virginia, are much less effective than would be desired. What about the other 49 states? Would such a study show similar results for them? If it did, would that mean we have an army of rather ineffective ABE teachers?

If courses in adult education and staff development activities don't seem to make one more student oriented, what will? How do we move the present ABE staff from the first quartile of student orientedness up to at least the third one? Assuming this is a needed, not just desirable, characteristic for ABE teachers, how do we screen out those without it or at least without a sufficient amount of it to be most effective?

The most intriguing question has just been hinted at. Is it really necessary? Where is the research which says adults learn best with a student oriented person as the instructor/facilitator?

I have a feeling student-orientedness is not nearly as critical as we think. It may be "desirable" but is it really necessary?

TABLE I
RAW SCORE DATA OF
ABE AND NON ABE TEACHERS

ABE N = 41			NON ABE N = 98		
Orientation			Orientation		
Neither	Student	Subject	Student	Subject	Neither
0	3	-1	3 26	-1	0
0	6	-8	6 27	-2	
	6	-11	6 29	-3	
	7	-12	7 29	-4	
	7	-12	7 29	-4	
	7	-13	9 30	-4	
	14	-15	9 30	-4	
	15	-20	9 31	-6	
	15	-21	9 33	-7	
	19	-25	9 33	-7	
	19	-25	10 34	-8	
	22	-47	10 35	-8	
	23		10 35	-9	
	23		12 35	-12	
	24		12 36	-13	
	25		14 36	-14	
	26		15 37	-15	
	30		16 39	-17	
	30		18 40	-18	
	31		18 40	-21	
	36		18 43	-22	
	39		18 44	-[illegible]	
	40		19 46	-23	
	41		19 46	-29	
	44		21 47	-30	
	54		22 47	-32	
	54		22 49	-34	
			22 49	-37	
			23 49	-39	
			23 61	-41	
			23 61	-48	
			24 65		
			24 68		

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
ABE	41	10.976	23.383	.459	.647 (NS)
NON ABE	98	13.122	25.833		

Table II
RAW SCORE DATA OF
ABE, ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND MISCELLANEOUS TEACHERS

ABE N = 41 Orientation			ELEMENTARY N = 37 Orientation		SECONDARY N = 51 Orientation			MISCELLANEOUS N = 10* Orientation	
Neither	Student	Subject	Student	Subject	Neither	Student	Subject	Student	Subject
0	3	-1	7	-2	0	3	-1	10	15
0	6	-8	7	-4		6	-3	15	29
	6	-11	10	-7		6	-4	18	48
	7	-12	10	-8		9	-4	19	
	7	-12	18	-12		9	-4	21	
	7	-13	18	-18		9	-6	35	
	14	-15	18	-28		9	-7	61	
	15	-20	19	-34		9	-8		
	15	-21	22	-37		12	-9		
	19	-25	22			12	-13		
	19	-25	23			14	-14		
	22	-47	23			16	-17		
	23		27			22	-21		
	23		29			23	-22		
	24		30			24	-23		
	25		31			24	-30		
	26		33			26	-32		
	30		35			29	-39		
	30		37			29	-41		
	31		40			30			
	36		43			33			
	39		44			34			
	40		46			35			
	41		47			36			
	44		47			36			
	54		49			39			
	54		49			40			
			61			46			
						49			
						65			
						68			

*Miscellaneous teachers are NON ABE teachers who could not be identified specifically as elementary or secondary.

Components	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Prob.
Between Groups	2050.094	3	683.365	1.09	.356
Within Groups	84688.640	135	627.323		

Groups	Means
ABE	10.976
Elementary	18.784
Secondary	9.882
Miscellaneous	8.700

Table III
RAW SCORE DATA OF
MALE ABE TEACHERS & MALE NON ABE TEACHERS

MALE ABE N = 16			MALE NON ABE N = 16	
	Orientation		Orientation	
Neither	Student	Subject	Student	Subject
0	3	-8	10	-22
	6	-20	15	-28
	7	-21	16	-29
	7		22	
	15		26	
	19		29	
	22		34	
	24		35	
	25		36	
	26		39	
	39		46	
	54		49	
			65	

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
ABE Males	16	12.375	19.970	1.069	.294 (NS)
NON ABE Males	16	21.438	27.420		

Table IV
RAW SCORE DATA OF
FEMALE ABE TEACHERS & FEMALE NON ABE TEACHERS

FEMALE ABE N = 22

Orientation		
Neither	Student	Subject
0	6	-1
	7	-11
	14	-12
	15	-12
	23	-13
	23	-15
	30	-25
	30	-47
	31	
	36	
	40	
	41	
	44	

FEMALE NON ABE N = 66

Orientation		
Student		Subject
3	31	-1
6	33	-2
6	33	-3
7	35	-4
7	40	-4
9	40	-4
9	43	-4
9	46	-6
9	47	-7
9	47	-7
10	49	-8
12	49	-8
14	61	-9
18		-12
18		-13
18		-15
19		-17
19		-18
22		-23
22		-30
23		-34
23		-37
24		-39
24		-48
27		
29		
29		
30		
30		

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
Female ABE	22	9.273	24.480	.190	.850 (NS)
Female NON ABE	66	10.394	23.793		

Table V
RAW SCORE DATA OF
SINGLE ABE TEACHERS AND SINGLE NON ABE TEACHERS

SINGLE ABE N = 9		SINGLE NON ABE N = 36		
Orientation		Orientation		
Student	Subject	Student	Subject	Neither
3	-15	7	-2	0
15	-20	7	-3	
26	-21	9	-8	
41	-25	9	-13	
	-25	9	-17	
		10	-18	
		10		
		15		
		16		
		18		
		18		
		19		
		22		
		23		
		23		
		29		
		30		
		31		
		33		
		33		
		34		
		35		
		35		
		36		
		44		
		47		
		47		
		49		
		68		

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
Single ABE	9	-2.333	24.642	2.824	.007 (S)
Single NON ABE	36	19.583	19.847		

Note: Because of the small number of subjects in the ABE group, the Mann-Whitney U was also used to evaluate these groups. Even though it is a less powerful test, it also shows the groups to be significantly different at the .05 level.

Table VI
RAW SCORE DATA OF
MARRIED ABE TEACHERS AND MARRIED NON ABE TEACHERS

MARRIED ABE N = 32			MARRIED NON ABE N = 58	
	Orientation		Orientation	
Neither	Student	Subject	Student	Subject
0	6	-1	3	-1
0	6	-8	6	-4
	7	-11	6	-4
	7	-12	9	-4
	7	-12	9	-4
	14	-13	10	-6
	15	-47	12	-7
	19		12	-7
	19		14	-8
	22		18	-9
	23		19	-12
	23		22	-14
	24		22	-15
	25		23	-21
	30		24	-22
	30		24	-23
	31		26	-28
	36		27	-29
	39		29	-30
	40		29	-34
	44		30	-37
	54		35	-39
	54		36	-48
			37	
			39	
			40	
			40	
			43	
			46	
			46	
			49	
			49	
			61	
			61	
			65	

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
Married ABE	32	14.719	21.975	.722	.472 (NS)
Married Non ABE	58	10.603	27.792		

Table VII
RAW SCORE DATA OF
ABE Teachers with less than a Masters Degree and
Non ABE Teachers with less than a Masters Degree

ABE WITH LESS THAN MASTERS N = 18

Orientation	
Student	Subject
6	-1
6	-11
7	-13
14	-20
23	-25
23	-47
26	
30	
36	
41	
44	
54	

NON ABE WITH LESS THAN MASTERS N = 75

Orientation		
Student	Subject	Neither
3 26	-2	0
6 27	-4	
6 29	-4	
7 29	-4	
7 30	-6	
9 31	-7	
9 33	-8	
9 33	-8	
9 34	-9	
10 35	-13	
10 36	-14	
12 36	-15	
14 37	-17	
15 40	-18	
16 40	-21	
18 43	-29	
18 44	-30	
18 46	-32	
18 46	-34	
19 47	-37	
19 49	-39	
22 49	-41	
22 61		
22 68		
23		
23		
24		

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
ABE	18	10.722	26.828	.380	.706 (NS)
Non ABE	75	13.253	25.035		

Table VIII
RAW SCORE DATA OF
ABE Teachers with a Masters Degree or Greater and
Non ABE Teachers with a Masters Degree or Greater

ABE WITH MASTERS OR GREATER N = 21			NON ABE WITH MASTERS OR GREATER N = 22	
Orientation			Orientation	
Neither	Student	Subject	Student	Subject
0	3	-8	9	-1
0	7	-12	10	-3
	7	-12	12	-4
	15	-15	23	-7
	15	-21	24	-12
	19	-25	29	-22
	19		30	-23
	22		35	-28
	24		35	-48
	25		39	
	31		47	
	39		61	
	54		65	

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
ABE	21	8.905	20.420	.439	.663 (N.S.)
Non ABE	22	12.318	29.503		

Table IX
RAW SCORE DATA OF
ABE Teachers with 3 or Fewer Years Public School Teaching Experience and Non ABE Teachers with 3 or Fewer Years Public School Teaching Experience

ABE WITH 3 OR FEWER YEARS EXPERIENCE N = 10		NON ABE WITH 3 OR FEWER YEARS EXPERIENCE N = 43		
Orientation		Orientation		
Student	Subject	Student	Subject	Neither
6	-13	3	-4	0
7		6	-8	
14		7	-13	
15		7	-17	
23		9	-18	
30		9	-30	
36		9		
40		9		
54		10		
		12		
		18		
		18		
		18		
		19		
		19		
		22		
		22		
		23		
		24		
		26		
		27		
		29		
		29		
		30		
		31		
		33		
		33		
		35		
		40		
		43		
		44		
		46		
		47		
		47		
		61		
		65		

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
ABE	10	21.200	14.498	.231	.818 (NS)
Non ABE	43	19.535	20.729		

Table X
RAW SCORE DATA OF
ABE Teachers with 4 or More Years Public School Teaching Experience and Non ABE Teachers with 4 or More Years Public School Teaching Experience

ABE WITH 4 OR MORE YEARS EXPERIENCE N = 22			NON ABE WITH 4 OR MORE YEARS EXPERIENCE N = 44	
Orientation			Orientation	
Neither	Student	Subject	Student	Subject
0	6	-1	6	-1
0	7	-8	9	-2
	7	-12	10	-3
	15	-15	10	-4
	19	-21	14	-4
	19	-25	16	-6
	22	-25	21	-7
	23	-47	22	-7
	24		23	-8
	31		23	-9
	39		24	-12
	44		29	-14
			30	-15
			34	-22
			35	-28
			35	-32
			36	-34
			37	-37
			39	-39
			40	-48
			46	
			49	
			49	
			61	

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
ABE	22	4.636	22.834	.547	.586 (NS)
Non ABE	44	8.318	27.103		

Table XI
RAW SCORE DATA OF
MALE ABE TEACHERS AND FEMALE ABE TEACHERS

MALE ABE N = 16			FEMALE ABE N = 22		
Orientation			Orientation		
Neither	Student	Subject	Student	Subject	Neither
0	3	8	6	-1	0
	6	20	7	-11	
	7	21	14	-12	
	7		15	-12	
	15		23	-13	
	19		23	-15	
	22		30	-25	
	24		30	-47	
	25		31		
	26		36		
	39		40		
	54		41		
			44		

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
Male ABE	16	12.375	19.970	.416	.680 (NS)
Female ABE	22	9.273	24.480		

Table XII
RAW SCORE DATA OF
SINGLE ABE TEACHERS AND MARRIED ABE TEACHERS

SINGLE ABE N = 9		MARRIED ABE N = 32		
Orientation		Orientation		
Student	Subject	Student	Subject	Neither
3	-15	6	-1	0
15	-20	6	-8	0
26	-21	7	-11	
41	-25	7	-12	
	-25	7	-12	
		14	-13	
		15	-47	
		19		
		19		
		22		
		23		
		23		
		24		
		25		
		30		
		30		
		31		
		36		
		39		
		40		
		44		
		54		
		54		

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
Single ABE	9	-2.333	24.642	2.00	.052 (NS)
Married ABE	32	14.719	21.975		

Table XIII
RAW SCORE DATA OF
ABE Teachers with less than a Masters Degree and
ABE Teachers with a Masters Degree or Greater

ABE WITH LESS THAN A MASTERS N = 18

Orientation	
Student	Subject
6	-1
6	-11
7	-13
14	-20
23	-25
23	-47
26	
30	
36	
41	
44	
54	

ABE WITH A MASTERS OR GREATER N = 21

Orientation		
Student	Subject	Neither
3	-8	0
7	-12	0
7	-12	
15	-15	
15	-21	
19	-25	
19		
22		
24		
25		
31		
39		
54		

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
Less than a Masters	18	10.722	26.828	.240	.812 (NS)
Greater than a Masters	21	8.905	20.420		

Table XIV
RAW SCORE DATA OF
ABE Teachers with 10 or Fewer Adult Education Credits
and ABE teachers with 11 or More Adult Education Credits

ABE WITH 10 OR FEWER A.E. CREDITS N = 19			ABE WITH 11 OR MORE A.E. CREDITS N = 15		
Orientation			Orientation		
Neither	Student	Subject	Student	Subject	Neither
0	3	-8	6	-11	0
	7	-13	7	-12	
	7	-20	15	-15	
	15	-21	23	-25	
	19	-25	25		
	19	-47	26		
	23		36		
	24		41		
	30		54		
	31		54		
	39				
	44				

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
10 or Fewer	19	6.684	24.194	.974	.338 (NS)
11 or More	15	14.933	24.956		

Table XV
RAW SCORE DATA OF
ABE Teachers With 0-3, 4-6, 7-10, And More Than 10
Years ABE Teaching Experience

0-3 YRS. ABE EXPERIENCE N = 17

Orientation	
Student	Subject
6	-13
7	-20
7	-21
14	-25
19	
19	
24	
30	
31	
36	
39	
40	
44	

4-6 YRS. ABE EXPERIENCE N = 12

Orientation	
Student	Subject
3	-11
15	-12
23	-47
23	
25	
26	
41	
54	
54	

7-10 YRS. ABE EXPERIENCE N = 6

Orientation	
Student	Subject
7	-1
15	-8
	-15
	-25

MORE THAN 10 YRS. ABE EXPERIENCE N = 5

Orientation		
Student	Subject	Neither
6	-12	0
22		0

Components	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Squares	F	Prob.
Between Groups	2203.092	3	734.364	1.37	.268 (NS)
Within Groups	19296.908	36	536.025		

Groups	Means
0-3 yrs.	13.941
4-6 yrs.	16.167
7-10 yrs.	-4.500
More than 10 yrs.	3.200

Table XVI
RAW SCORE DATA OF
ABE Teachers with Three or Fewer Years Public School Teaching Experience and ABE Teachers with Four or More Years Public School Teaching Experience

ABE WITH THREE OR FEWER YEARS EXPERIENCE N = 10	
Orientation	
Student	Subject
6	-13
7	
14	
15	
23	
30	
36	
40	
54	

ABE WITH FOUR OR MORE YEARS EXPERIENCE N = 22		
Orientation		
Student	Subject	Neither
6	-1	0
7	-8	0
7	-12	
15	-15	
19	-21	
19	-25	
22	-25	
23	-47	
24		
31		
39		
44		

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
3 or Fewer	10	21.200	19.498	1.984	.056 (NS)
4 or More	22	4.636	22.834		

Table XVII
RAW SCORE DATA OF
PART-TIME ABE TEACHERS AND FULL-TIME ABE TEACHERS

PART-TIME ABE TEACHERS N = 25			FULL-TIME ABE TEACHERS N = 15	
Orientation			Orientation	
Neither	Student	Subject	Student	Subject
0	6	-8	3	-1
0	7	-12	6	-11
	7	-20	7	-12
	14	-21	23	-13
	15	-25	26	-15
	15		40	-25
	19		41	-47
	19		54	
	22			
	23			
	24			
	25			
	30			
	31			
	36			
	39			
	44			
	54			

Source	N	Mean	S.D.	t	Prob.
Part-time	25	13.760	20.602	1.138	.262 (NS)
Full-time	15	5.067	27.523		

REFERENCES

Denver, Wayman R. and Robert R. Price. Perceptions of the Nature and Scope of Effective Adult Vocational Teacher Characteristics as Held by Adult Students, Teachers, and Coordinators of Adult Education in Oklahoma Area Vocational-Technical Centers. Oklahoma State Department of Vocational & Technical Education, 1972.

Knowles, Malcolm S. The Modern Practice of Adult Education. New York: Associated Press, 1970, 48.

McDaniel, Gary D. Comparison of Verbal Behavior of Teachers Teaching Both ABE & Public School Classes. (Doctoral Dissertation, August 1969) Commerce, Texas: East Texas State University.

Mocker, Donald W. A Report on the Identification, Classification, and Ranking of Competencies Appropriate for Adult Basic Education Teachers. Kansas City, Missouri: University of Missouri - Kansas City School of Education, 1974.

Nave, Wallace K. ABE Teacher Trainers, Their Characteristics, Attitudes and Values. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina State University School of Education, 1969.

Snyder, Frank. The Professional Needs of Adult Basic Education Teachers in the State of Maryland. (Doctoral Dissertation, 1968) Washington, D.C.: George Washington University.